APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,994	03/11/2004	Tadd H. Giles	13768.783.75	5167

47973   7590   01/15/2008
WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER
ZHANG, SHIRLEY X

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
4121	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/15/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/797,994	GILES ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SHIRLEY X. ZHANG	4121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 March 2004*.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-25 and 27-34* is/are pending in the application.
  4a) Of the above claim(s) ___ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-25, 27-32* is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) *33-34* is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *11 March 2004* is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
    1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
    3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date *12/19/2005*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
  Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to the U.S. patent application no. 10/797,994 filed on March 11, 2004.

It is acknowledged that a preliminary amendment was filed on March 07, 2005 to cancel claim 26 and add new claims 33 and 34.

Information Disclosure Statement

1. An information disclosure statement (IDS) was submitted on December 19, 2005 after the mailing of the original application on March 11, 2004. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the examiner is considering the information disclosure statement.

Claim Objections

2. **Claims 33 and 34** are objected to because of the following informality: the copy of the "Preliminary Amendment" received by the Office on March 07, 2005 does not contain the full-text of claim 33, while claim 34 is missing.

On the paper received by the Office, claim 33 reads as follows:

33.   (New): The method of claim 25 further comprising, adding a record to a set of records

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.   **Claims 1-3, 10-12, 14, 15, 17-21, 25, 27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being anticipated by U.S. patent application publication no. 2003/0172118 to Bilansky et

al., hereinafter "Bilansky".

Regarding claim 1, Bilansky teaches a computing device, a method comprising:

maintaining, on a client device, state information associated with an identifier of a

filtered-out message, the state information indicating that the message was filtered out for

not having met filtering criteria ([0050] discloses that a mail attribute file is created on

the client to store per message attributes; the attributes include flags such as

"seen/unseen" where the flag "unseen" indicates that the message has been processed but

filtered out by the user; [0051] further discloses that a unique ID retrieved from the POP3

server is used to identify a message and its attributes);

determining whether message data corresponding to an identified message is to be

downloaded from a server to the client device, including determining that the client

device does not already have the message data and that the message does not have the

associated state information that indicates the message was filtered out for not having met

the filtering criteria ([0059] discloses that a determination is made as to whether the UID

is present in the mail attribute file, which step involves determining whether a message identified by the UID has been read (i.e. downloaded), unread (i.e. filtered-out) or unprocessed); and

if it is determined that the message data is to be downloaded, downloading the message data corresponding to the message to the client device ([0047] discloses that individual lectronic mail messages are retrieved when and if the user selects an electronic mail message from mail list).

Regarding claim 2, Bilansky teaches the method of claim 1 wherein maintaining the state information comprises maintaining a record for each message of a set of at least one message, the record identifying the message relative to any other message ([0050] discloses a mail attribute file created on the client to store per message attributes).

Regarding claim 3, Bilansky teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising, obtaining a list of messages from the server ([0046] discloses that a list of message headers are retrieved by mail program 710).

Regarding claim 10, Bilansky teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising, determining whether the downloaded message data corresponding to the message meets the filtering criteria, and if so, saving the message data to a message store ([0053] discloses that parameters such as file size and file type may be used to filter attachments along with the filtering performed on a per message basis, and the downloaded attachments are stored in saved folder 722, a message store; note that the user's selection process disclosed in [0047] is also a form of filtering, the result of which is that a message's entry in the mail attribute file is marked "read" or "unread").

Regarding claim 11, Bilansky teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising, determining whether the downloaded message data corresponding to the message meets the filtering criteria, and if not, maintaining state information for that message indicating that the message was filtered out for not having met the filtering criteria (the user's selection process disclosed in [0047] is a form of filtering, the result of which is that a message's entry in the mail attribute file is marked "read" or "unread", where "unread" indicates that the message was filtered out).

Regarding claim 12, Bilansky teaches the method of claim 11 wherein maintaining the state information for that message comprises creating a record for that message, the record including a field that uniquely identifies the message ([0050] discloses that a mail attribute file is created on the client to store per message attributes; [0051] further discloses that each entry in the attribute file includes a unique ID (UID)).

Regarding claim 14, Bilansky teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions which when executed, perform the method of claim 1 (Bilansky, Abstract, discloses that computer instructions is a form of the invention).

Regarding claim 15, Bilansky teaches in a computing device, a method comprising: retrieving a list of message identifiers from a server ([0046] discloses that a list of message headers is retrieved by mail program 710);

for each message identifier, determining whether the message identifier corresponds to a message that meets filtering criteria, does not meet the filtering criteria or is unknown with respect to the filtering criteria ([0059] discloses that for each unprocessed UID in the list, a determination is made as to whether the UID is present in

the mail attribute file, which contains information as to whether a message is read,

unread, or absent, i.e., whether a message meets, does not meet or is unknown); and

for each message that is unknown with respect to the filtering criteria,

downloading message data from the server ([0059] discloses that if the UID is absent

from the mail attribute file, the UID and associated attributes are added to the mail

attribute file, which is refreshed to reflect information from new messages and

displayed), evaluating the message data to determine whether the message meets or does

not meet the filtering criteria ([0047] discloses that the user reviews and selects an

electronic mail message from mail list for display; the user selection is considered a type

of filtering), and persisting data indicative of whether the message met or did not meet

the filtering criteria ([0050] discloses that mail attribute file is updated on each mail

operation on the client, therefore, if a message is selected for display, it will be marked

with the flag "read" to indicate that it meets the user's selection criteria, otherwise the

message is marked "unread").

Regarding claim 17, Bilansky teaches the method of claim 15 wherein

determining whether the message identifier corresponds to a message that meets the

filtering criteria comprises determining whether message data is saved in a message store

([0059] discloses that for each unprocessed UID, a determination is made as to whether

the UID is present in the mail attribute file, which file contains information as to whether

a message is read, unread, or absent, where the flag "read" indicates that the message

meets the user's selection criteria)

Regarding claim 18, Bilansky teaches the method of claim 15 wherein

determining whether message data is saved in a message store comprises evaluating a set

of message store records ([0059] discloses that the mail attribute "read/unread" or delete

is used to determine whether message data is saved in the "saved folder" as disclosed in

Fig. 7).

Regarding claim 19, Bilansky teaches the method of claim 15 wherein

determining whether the message identifier corresponds to a message that does not meet

the filtering criteria comprises determining whether a record for that message exists in a

set of records for already checked messages ([0059] discloses that for each unprocessed

UID, a determination is made as to whether the UID is present in the mail attribute file,

which is a set of records fro already checked messages).

Regarding claim 20, Bilansky teaches the method of claim 19 wherein message

data is downloaded for a message, wherein the message data indicates that the message

does not meet the filtering criteria ([0053] discloses that for the attachment of a message,

the user can decide whether to move it to a local folder or not on a per message basis,

other filtering criteria such as file size and file type can also be used to filter the

attachment) and wherein persisting data comprises adding a record to the set of records

for already checked messages, the record identifying the message ([0050] disclose that

mail attribute file is updated on each mail operation on the client, i.e., a record is always

added to the mail attribute file for a message whose record was not found in the file).

Regarding claim 21, Bilansky teaches the method of claim 15 wherein

determining whether the message identifier corresponds to a message that meets filtering

criteria, does not meet the filtering criteria or is unknown with respect to the filtering

criteria comprises evaluating at least one set of records ([0059] discloses evaluating the

mail attribute file to determine whether a UID corresponds to a message that is read,

unread or absent, which indicates whether the message meets the filtering criteria; the

mail attribute file contains at least one set of records).

Regarding claim 25, Bilansky teaches the method of claim 19 wherein message

data is downloaded for a message, wherein the message data indicates that the message

meets the filtering criteria ([0053] discloses that for the attachment of a message, the user

can decide whether to move it to a local folder or not on a per message basis, other

filtering criteria such as file size and file type can also be used to filter the attachment),

and wherein persisting data comprises saving the message data to a message store ([0050]

disclose that mail attribute file is updated on each mail operation on the client, i.e., a

record is always added to the mail attribute file for a message whose record was not

found in the file).

Regarding claim 27, Bilansky teaches a computer-readable medium having

computer-executable instructions which when executed, perform the method of claim 15

(Bilansky, Abstract, discloses that computer instructions is a form of the invention).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

     1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
     2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
     3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
     4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4.   **Claims 8 and 9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bilansky as applied to claim 1 above , and further in view of U.S. patent no. 7,209,911 to Boothby et al., hereinafter "Boothby".

     Regarding claim 8, Bilansky teaches the method of claim 1.

     Bilansky does not teach but Boothby teaches determining that the filtering criteria have changed, and in response, invalidating the state information (column 21, lines 5-10 disclose that if the filter changes, then the history file that contains state information from the previous filter can not be used).

     It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bilansky with Boothby so that the state information from previous filtering is invalidated if the filtering criteria have changed. One would have been motivated to combine Bilansky and Boothby by the fact that both taught methods for synchronizing data

between two devices using filtering criteria, therefore the combination can be made with a reasonable expectation of success.

Regarding claim 9, Bilansky teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the state information is maintained in a record for each filtered-out message ([0050] discloses that the mail attribute file maintains the read/unread status of a message, where the "unread" state indicates that the message is filtered-out by the user in the previous round of processing).

Bilansky does not disclose but Boothby discloses determining that the filtering criteria has changed, and in response, removing the record from a set of records (Boothby, column 8, lines 29-33 disclose that for a changing filter, records that were previously within the filter may not be within the current filter, i.e., they should be included in the current filtering process, and the previous marking of "filtered-out" should be removed for these records).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Bilansky with Boothby so that a record that was previously filtered out should be removed from the filtered-out list and included in the current filtering process if the filtering criteria have changed. One would have been motivated to combine Bilansky and Boothby by the fact that both taught methods for synchronizing data between two devices using filtering criteria, therefore the combination can be made with a reasonable expectation of success.

5.   **Claims 5-7, 13, and 22-24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bilansky et al. as applied to claims 1 and 21 above, respectively, further in view of U.S. patent no. 6,647,409 to Sherman et al., hereinafter "**Sherman**",

which is cited in the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) submitted by the applicant

on 12/19/2005.

Regarding claim 5, Bilansky teaches the method of claim 3 wherein maintaining

the state information comprises maintaining a record set comprising a record for each

message ([0050] discloses the mail attribute file as a record set), each record identifying a

message relative to any other message ([0051] discloses that each entry in the mail

attribute file is uniquely identified by a unique message ID from the server),

Bilansky teaches processing the list of messages against the mail attribute file by

identifying whether a message in the list matches one in the mail attribute file.

Bilansky does not explicitly disclose but Sherman discloses marking each record

(column 10, lines 54-59 disclose that a list of items on the H/PC can be marked for

preservation or, alternatively, marked for disposal; therefore, marking or unmarking

records for a particular purpose is an implementation detail that is of little significance

because it does not alter the result of the operation, which is to indicate which records

will be preserved and which ones will be deleted), processing the list of messages

obtained from the server (Fig. 6 and column 9, lines 33-35 disclose that the loop body

operation flow depicted in Fig. 6 is conducted separately for each item on the server list),

and unmarking each record upon determining that the record corresponds to a message

identified in the list such that each record corresponding to a message that is not in the

list remains marked (the argument above for "marking each record" applies here).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine

Bilansky with Sherman so that the list of messages from the server is processed against

local records on the client. One would have been motivated to combine Bilansky and

Sherman by the fact that both taught methods for synchronizing emails between a

handheld device and the mail server by comparing the server list with the local list to

identify messages that meet the filtering criteria so that they can be downloaded or

preserved.

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Bilansky and Sherman teaches the

method of claim 5.

Bilansky does not teach but Sherman teaches removing a record from the record

set if that record remains marked after processing the list of messages (column 10, lines

4-6 disclose that all local items would have to be tested against the server item list to

determine whether any local copies should be deleted as not being on the server; column

10, lines 54-59 further following analysis of all items on the server list, a list of items on

the H/PC can be marked for preservation or, alternatively, marked for disposal; By

following the loop operation on Fig. 6, it can be found that all local items that remain

unmarked include those that are no longer on the server).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill to combine Bilansky and

Sherman such that messages deleted from the mail server are also deleted from the

client's records. One would have been motivated to combine Bilansky and Sherman by

the fact that both taught methods for synchronizing emails between a handheld device

and the mail server by comparing the server list with the local list to identify messages

that meet the filtering criteria so that they can be downloaded or preserved.

Regarding claim 7, the combination of Bilansky and Sherman teaches the

method of claim 5. Bilansky further teaches marking each record comprises setting a flag

associated with each record ([0050] disclose that the message attributes include a flag to

indicate which messages have been viewed).

Regarding claim 13, Bilansky teaches the method of claim 1. Bilansky does not

disclose that the filtering criteria comprise a time window.

However, Sherman teaches using a predetermined date range as the filtering

criteria in column 9, lines 44-47.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine

Bilansky with Sherman so that the filtering criteria comprise a time window. One would

have been motivated to combine Bilansky and Sherman by the fact that both taught

methods for synchronizing emails between a handheld device and the mail server using

filtering criteria, and as the mail header inherently has a date and time field for each

message, the combination could have been made with a reasonable expectation of

success.

Regarding claim 22, Bilansky teaches the method of claim 21.

Bilansky does not disclose but Boothby discloses removing a record if that record

does not correspond to a message identifier in the list of messages (column 10, lines 3-6

disclose that all local items would have to be tested against the server item to determine

whether any local copies should be deleted as not being on the server);

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill to combine Bilansky and

Sherman such that messages deleted from the mail server are also deleted from the

client's records. One would have been motivated to combine as such by the fact both

Bilansky and Sherman taught methods for synchronizing emails between a handheld

device and the mail server using filtering criteria, and as the mail header inherently has a

date and time field for each message, the combination could have been made with a reasonable expectation of success.

Regarding claim 23, the combination of Bilansky and Sherman teaches the method of claim 21.

Bilansky does not disclose Sherman discloses unmarking a record marked for possible removal when it is determined that the message identifier corresponds to a message that meets filtering criteria or does not meet the filtering criteria (Fig. 6 discloses marking a record for preservation if it meets the filtering criteria; therefore, items that are not marked for preservation are candidates for deletion; column 10, lines 57-59 further disclose that alternatively, items can be marked for disposal, i.e., unmarked for preservation).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill to combine Bilansky and Sherman such that the method un-marks a record marked for possible removal when it is determined that the message identifier corresponds to a message that meets filtering criteria or does not meet the filtering criteria. One would have been motivated to make the combination by the fact that both Bilansky and Sherman taught methods for synchronizing emails between a handheld device and the mail server using filtering criteria, and as the mail header inherently has a date and time field for each message, the combination could have been made with a reasonable expectation of success.

Regarding claim 24, the combination of Bilansky and Sherman teaches the method of claim 23. Bilansky further teaches unmarking the record comprises clearing a flag associated with the record ([0050] discloses the attributes include a flag to indicate

which messages have been viewed, a flag to identify if messages selected for deletion, which can all be unmarked by clearing the flag, as is inherent in Bilansky).

6.   **Claims 4, 16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bilansky as applied to claims 1, 15 above, further in view of IETF RFC 1739, "Post Office Protocol – Version 3", hereinafter "RFC 1739".

        Regarding claims 4 and 16, Bilansky teaches the method of claim 3 and 15 respectively. Bilansky further teaches using POP3 as the mail retrieval protocol ([0008] discloses that he invention provides a method and apparatus for managing electronic mail message from a post office protocol 3 server), wherein obtaining the list of messages comprises issuing a command to a POP3 server and receiving a plurality of unique message identifiers in response ([0046] discloses that a list of message headers are retrieved from POP3 mail server using the POP3 command "TOP").

        Bilansky does not teach using the UIDL command for the purpose of obtaining a list of messages. However, RFC 1739 discloses the UIDL command for retrieving a list of a list of message headers from the server.

        It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Bilansky's teaching of using POP3 server with RFC 1739's teaching of UIDL command so that a list of messages are retrieved by issuing a UIDL command. One would have been motivated to make such combination by the fact that Bilansky's invention is on using POP3 protocol to manage e-mails, and at the time the present invention was made, the UIDL command had been added to POP3 protocol to ease the task of message header retrieval in POP3. It was therefore highly desirable to use the UIDL command at the time of the invention.

7.   **Claims 28-32** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

U.S. patent application publication no. 2003/0172118 to Bilansky et al., hereinafter

"Bilansky", further in view of IETF RFC 1739, "Post Office Protocol – Version 3",

hereinafter "RFC 1739".

       Regarding claim 28, Bilansky teaches a computer-readable medium having

stored thereon a data structure, comprising: a set of records ([0050] discloses the mail

attribute file as a set of records), each record having data that identifies a message ([0051]

discloses that each entry in the attribute is identified with a unique ID) with associated

message data that has been evaluated against filtering criteria and failed to meet the

filtering criteria ([0053] discloses that parameters such as file size and file type may be

used to filter attachments along with the filtering performed on a per message basis); and

wherein when a request to synchronize client data with server data is received, at least

one message identifier of a list of message identifiers received from the server is

processed against the set of records, to determine, for each such processed message

identifier, whether message data corresponding to that message identifier needs to be

downloaded for comparing against the filtering criteria, or whether the processed

identifier corresponds to a message that already failed to meet the filtering criteria

([0059] discloses each unprocessed UID selected the list of messages from the header is

compared against entries in the mail attribute file to determine if the message has been

processed).

       Regarding claim 29, Bilansky teaches the data structure of claim 28.

       Bilansky does not teach but RFC 1739 discloses that the data in the record that

identifies the message comprises a hash value corresponding to a unique message

identifier (RFC 1739, page 13 discloses that the parameter unqiue-id can be a hash value
of the message).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention to combine Bilansky's teaching of using POP3 server with RFC 1739's
teaching of UIDL command so that a list of messages are retrieved by issuing a UIDL
command. One would have been motivated to make such combination by the fact that
Bilansky's invention is on using POP3 protocol to manage e-mails, and at the time the
present invention was made, the UIDL command had been added to POP3 protocol to
ease the task of message header retrieval in POP3. It was therefore highly desirable to
use the UIDL command at the time of the invention.

Regarding claim 30, Bilansky teaches the data structure of claim 28 wherein the
data in the record that identifies the message corresponds to a unique message identifier
of a POP3 message ([0051] discloses that the UIDs are retrieved from the POP3 server).

Regarding claim 31, Bilansky teaches the data structure of claim 28 wherein
each record further includes a flag that is used to determine whether the message
corresponding to that record was listed in the list received from the server ([0051]
discloses that the stored UID values are used to recognized the arrival of more recent
messages that those that are already represented in the mail list).

Regarding claim 32, Bilansky teaches the data structure of claim 28 wherein at
least some of the records include a field having data representative of a time or date
([0039] discloses that attributes managed by an IMAP mail server include priority, recent
and dates; As Bilansky intends to replicate the IMAP attributes on POP3 clients, it is
inherent that the "date" is one of the attributes managed by Bilansky's POP3 mail clients).

Conclusion

8.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

US 5961590 A, Mendez; Daniel J. et al., System and method for synchronizing

electronic mail between a client site and a central site;

US 5999932 A, Paul; Sunil, System and method for filtering unsolicited

electronic mail messages using data matching and heuristic processing;

US 7039678 B1, Halahmi; Erez et al., E-mail proxy;

US 7194510 B2, Sherman; Roman et al., Maintaining a sliding view of server-

based data on a handheld personal computer;

US 20030055907 A1, Stiers, Todd, Clientless electronic mail MIME attachment

re-delivery system via the web to reduce network bandwidth usage;

US 20030172118 A1, Bilansky, Mark Alan et al., Method and apparatus for

providing post office protocol 3 support for limited storage devices;

US 6052735 A, Ulrich; Bryce et al., Electronic mail object synchronization

between a desktop computer and mobile device;

US 7209949 B2, Mousseau; Gary P. et al., System and method for synchronizing

information between a host system and a mobile data communication device;

US 6725239 B2, Sherman; Roman et al., Selective information synchronization

based on implicit user designation;

US 6505214 B1, Sherman; Roman et al., Selective information synchronization

based on implicit user designation;

US 5951636 A, Zerber; Kevin Gregory, Accessing a post office system from a client computer using applets;

US 20040059791 A, SHERMAN, R et al., E-mail message selective maintenance method in handheld personal computer, involves downloading or deleting e-mail message based on determination of mail satisfying predetermined criteria;

US 7290034 B2, Budd; Robin et al., Method and system for polling a server for new emails, downloading the new emails in a background process, and caching the downloaded emails for access by an email application of an electronic device, such as a portable computer;

US 7243163 B1, Friend; John et al., System and method for full wireless synchronization of a data processing apparatus with a messaging system;

US 6330618 B1, Hawkins; Jeffrey C. et al., Method and apparatus for synchronizing a portable computer system with a desktop computer system

US 5974238 A, Chase, Jr.; Charlie David, Automatic data synchronization between a handheld and a host computer using pseudo cache including tags and logical data elements;

US 6633924 B1, Wu; Charles et al., Object synchronization between objects stores on different computers;

US 6324544 B1, Alam; Salim et al., File object synchronization between a desktop computer and a mobile device;

US 6125369 A, Wu; Charles et al., Continuous object sychronization between object stores on different computers;

WO 9922305 A1, FLANAGIN, STEVE et al., SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR

INTERACTION BETWEEN A DESKTOP COMPUTER AND MULTIPLE MOBILE

DEVICES;

US 6636897 B1, Sherman; Roman et al., Selective information subset

synchronization based on single user action;

US 6654787 B1, Aronson; Daniel Alex et al., Method and apparatus for filtering

e-mail;

US 6141664 A, Boothby; David J., Synchronization of databases with date range;

US 6212529 B1, Boothby; David J. et al., Synchronization of databases using

filters;

US 6732149 B1, Kephart; Jeffrey Owen, System and method for hindering

undesired transmission or receipt of electronic messages;

US 6421709 B1, McCormick; William B. et al., E-mail filter and method thereof;

US 6134582 A, Kennedy; Kevin Alan, System and method for managing

electronic mail messages using a client-based database;

US 6654787 B, ARONSON, D A et al., E-mail filtering method for Internet,

involves receiving request to retrieve e-mail message from server to filter message based

on rules, and transferring filtered messages to client and storing non-transferred message

on server;

GB 2350747 A, KEPHART, J O, Hindering method for undesirable transmission

or receipt of electronic messages within network of users includes automatically

extracting detection data that permits detection of the specific electronic message;

US 6711609 B2, Boyer; Monty et al., Method and apparatus for synchronizing an

email client on a portable computer system with an email client on a desktop computer;

US 6052709 A, Paul; Sunil, Apparatus and method for controlling delivery of

unsolicited electronic mail;

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to SHIRLEY X. ZHANG whose telephone number is

(571)270-5012. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday

7:30am - 5:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Taghi Arani can be reached on (571) 272-3787. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call

800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. X. Z./
Examiner, Art Unit 4121

/Taghi T. Arani/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4121
1/12/2007